

REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in response to the office action dated June 1, 2006. The claims have been amended in order to overcome the rejections thereof under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Regarding the objection to claim 36, it is noted that the “telephone interface means” is different from the “PSTN interface means”, which is why the word “said” before it would not be appropriate.

The examiner has rejected claims 33-39 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over a number of prior-art patents. One of the secondary references used by the examiner was U.S. Patent No. 6,208,639 – Murai. However, as explained in previously-filed amendment, a Declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 was filed in the parent application in which supportive proof had been submitted proving that actual reduction to practice of the invention was effected in September, 1995. Since the filing date of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,639 is after that date, it cannot serve as prior art against the claims of the instant application. It is, also, noted that the foreign priority date of August 31, 1995 of the Murai patent cannot be used to establish this patent as available prior art (see Section 2126.01 of the MPEP). It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that U.S. Patent No. 6,208,639 is not prior art against the claims of the present invention.

For the same reason as that given above with regard to U.S. Patent No. 6,208,639, the primary reference to Deng, U.S. Patent No. 5,862, 134 is also not available as prior art against the claims of the instant application, since the September, 1995 reduction-to-practice date of the instant invention precedes the December 29, 1995 filing date of the Deng patent. It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that U.S. Patent No. 5,862,134 is not prior art against the claims of the present invention.

Since all of the rejections based on prior art in the office action dated June 1, 2006 used the Deng patent as the primary reference, and since the rejection of claims 33-35, 38 and 39 used the Murai patent as a secondary reference, it is respectfully submitted that those rejections have been overcome in the light of the fact that the Deng and Murai patents are not available prior art, since the instant invention was reduced to practice prior to the filing dates of these two patents, in accordance with 37 CFR 1.131(b). .

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

Milton S. Gerstein
Reg. No. 27,891

MUCH SHELIST
191 N. Wacker Drive
Suite 1700
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 521-2776
(312) 521-2876 FAX